

REMARKS

The comments of the Applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the Examiner (in small, bold type).

3. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that:

(A) The prior art of Levy fails to teach determining whether an input URL is a channel URL that is a set of URLs followed by requesting contents from a plurality of web servers associated with the respective URLs.

As to point (A), Levy teaches a customer (user) entering their information (col. 6 lines 8-19; col. 5, lines 45-54) and an input URL (col. 4, lines 43-45) that corresponds a web server of a set (col. 4, lines 45-51; col. 5, lines 55-64) that proves the contents of a predetermined subject (col. 5, lines 47-51). If correctly made, a request is sent to a plurality of web servers for the content that is associated with the respective URL (col. 4, lines 53-58; col. 5, lines 14-21).

The Applicant disagrees. Claim 2 recites a data server that determines whether an input URL is a channel URL that is of a set of URLs, each URL of the set corresponding to a web server. Although Levy discloses a user entering an URL to access an information retrieval system 10, the input URL in Levy is an URL pointing to the information retrieval system 10. After the user gains access to the system 10, the system 10 shows the user a list of information services that can be chosen by the user for delivery to the user's cell phone (col. 4, lines 43-52). In Levy, the URL pointing to the system 10 is just one URL, not a set of URLs each corresponding to a web server.

(B) The prior art of Levy fails to teach binding gathered contents from a plurality of web servers, as it merely teaches gathering information.

As to point (B), Levy teaches retrieving information front a plurality of web servers (process of fig. 8) and binding the desired content (col. 9, lines 15-47) After receiving the information, it is bound and transmitted before it reaches its destination (col. 9, lines 15-47; col. 9, lines 60-65).

The Applicant disagrees. Levy discloses an information retrieval system that allows the user to select from a list of information services, and to specify when and how the information is delivered. In Levy, each piece of information is treated separately, i.e., can have different delivery schedules and delivery destinations (col. 5, lines 5-13). Levy does not disclose "binding the gathered contents into a single channel, and transmitting the single channel of contents to the portable terminal," as recited in claim 2. For example, Levy discloses an example of using a short message system to deliver the information (col. 4, lines 14-17). Each piece of information

would be a separate short message. Even if the different short messages are sent to the same mobile device according to the same schedule, the different short messages are not bound into a single channel, as recited in claim 2.

4. Claims 2, 3, 7 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities:
In claims 2 and 7, the use of multiple ";" and ".
In claim 3, "billing sewer".
In claim 23 (part c), capitalized "URLS".
Appropriate correction is required.

The claims have been amended.

6. Claims 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 20, 23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102).

15. Claims 3, 4, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), further in view of Ronen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

20. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), further in view of Fuh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,474).

22. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997), Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), and Ronen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,736), further in view of Kappel (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

24. Claims 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Patent 6,556,997) and Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent 6,857,102), further in view of Kappel (U.S. Patent 5,905,736).

Levy does not disclose or suggest "a data server determining whether the input URL ... is the channel URL that is of a set of URLs, each URL of the set corresponding to a web server" and "binding the gathered contents into a single channel," as recited in claim 2, for reasons discussed above. What is missing in Levy is also not disclosed or suggested in Bickmore, Ronen, Fuh, or Kappel.

Claims 7, 20, and 23 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those applied to claim 2.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those applied to the claims on which they depend.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply \$60 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee, and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2007 _____

/Rex I. Huang/ _____

Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906